

Bidder			
Evaluator			
	<u>Mandatory/</u>	<u>Score</u>	
<u>Section 5 Requirements</u>	<u>Optional</u>	<u>(0-3)</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Type of proposal:			
Expansion			
Replacement			
Combination			
Partnership? (Y/N)			
5.1 Complete solution proposed	M		
5.2 If joint proposal, is prime contractor specified?	M		
5.3 If any software is included, is it certified to be year-2000 compliant?	M		
5.4 Minimum data bandwidth of 56 kb/s? Incremental costs for increased B/W stated? Higher B/W proposed based on size of school?	M		
5.5 Scalable B/W without significant modification or capital outlay? Range of possible B/W expansion stated?	M		
5.6 Access to the Internet proposed?	M		
5.7 Two-way interactive video to each high-school? B/W proposed? Restrictions on number of concurrent conferences?	M		

5.8 Is desktop video proposed?	O		
5.9 Is proposed interactive video capable of being connected to, and operate with, existing regional video consortia?	M		
5.10 Total one-time costs to be borne by the State which are associated with implementing the proposed facilities must be itemized. One-time costs for each year during the three-year implementation schedule discussed in Section 3 must be shown.	M		
5.11 Annual recurring costs until June 30, 2002, which must be borne by the State following installation of the required telecommunications capabilities must be itemized.	M		
5.12 Estimated annual recurring costs which must be borne by the State for the period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2006, must be itemized. Rationale for the estimates must be stated.	M		
5.13 Proposals must state the estimated one-time and annual recurring costs, through June 30, 2002, which would be the burden of the individual school districts to utilize the proposed system. Rationale for costs given?	M		
5.14 Specific equipment or wiring requirements beyond the NCP which will be required of the individual schools must be stated.	M		

5.15 All equipment to be provided at the NCP by the proposer must be specified.	M		
5.16 Technical specifications (i.e., industry standard interface specifications) for data connectivity, local area network connectivity, and video connectivity (if appropriate) to the NCP within each school building must be stated.	M		
5.17 Responsibilities of the State and requirements placed on the school districts and individual school buildings for ongoing management, operation and maintenance of the proposed facilities must be stated.	M		
5.18 Responsibilities of the vendor for ongoing management, operation and maintenance of the proposed facilities must be stated.	M		
5.19 Proposes a total package which includes maintenance, management and operation of the proposed facilities. The costs for initial implementation, and for management, maintenance and operation must be stated separately.	O		
5.20 Provisions or restrictions of State or federal regulations which could impact implementation, and/or which could affect one-time and long-term costs?	M		
5.21 Universal Service Fund issues. (See test of RFP for complete statement of requirements).	M		

5.22 Proposals must guarantee price protection for the duration of the initial contract period.	M		
5.23 Proposals must guarantee that any price reductions realized by the vendor as a result of implementation of State or federal telecommunications regulations will be passed on to the State during the contract period.	M		
5.24 System reliability expectations, service plan, redundancy and re-routing (See text of RFP for complete statement)	M		
5.25 All travel and lodging expenses associated with warranty and maintenance of the system will be the responsibility of the vendor.	M		
5.26 Warranty of equipment installed must extend one year beyond the initial contract period (i.e., until June 30, 2003).	M		
5.27 Responses must state availability of service assistance which will be provided to assure reliable operation, including problem response time and problem escalation procedures.	M		
5.28 Training and travel issues (See text of RFP for complete statement).	M		

1000
1000
1000

STATE OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND INFORMATION
PROCUREMENT SERVICES DIVISION

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 0409-D
SEPTEMBER 30, 1997

TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION PROJECT
FOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

RESPONSES:

POINTS

TAMSCO RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS, LLC
2500 LOUISIANA BLVD. SUITE 220
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87110

119

TCI
5619 DTC PARKWAY
ENGLEWOOD, CO 80111-3000

130

US WEST
6101 YELLOWSTONE ROAD
CHEYENNE, WY 82009

155

AWARDED

DECLINED TO RESPOND: AT&T

ACE ELECTRIC

TRW INTEGRATED ENGINEERING DIVISION

WALKER AND ASSOCIATES

EDUCATION MANAGEMENT GROUP

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES

NORTEL

1000

Bidder	TCI	
Evaluator	Group	
<u>Section 6 Evaluation</u>	<u>Score</u> <u>(0-3)</u>	<u>Comments</u>
6.1 <u>Functionality (30%)</u>		
6.1.1 Deliverable technology	3	
6.1.2 Compatible with existing technologies and facilities	2	Proposal indicates upgrade of Big Horn Basin equipment...costs??? Didn't address data.
6.1.3 A totally integrated system for education and State government, as applicable	2	Appears to have provisions to integrate other facilities
6.1.4 Non proprietary (adheres to industry standards)	3	
6.1.5 Reliability	2	
6.1.6 Scaleable	2	
6.1.7 Provisions for maintaining compatibility with future technology	2	
6.1.8 Flexible service offerings	1	Reference to cost proposal, which does not address service offerings...only implementation/payment offerings.
6.1.9 Reasonable response times to requests for installation of new services or de-installation of existing services (i.e., moves/adds/changes)	3	Does not give actual response time...only says they will offer "reasonable response times".
6.2 <u>Pricing (20%)</u>	20	6
6.2.1 Long-run total costs (one-time plus five year recurring) for proposed system	2	Cost proposal very vague and confusing

COPY

of Electronic
Archived doc.
Documenta Times

6.2.2 Contract renewal options	2	
6.2.3 Long-term price protection	3	
6.2.4 Lowest price guarantee	3	
6.2.5 Innovative price plans	3	6.2.2 - 6.2.5 references cost proposal, which does not address any of these items.
6.2.6 Schedule of additional costs and deductions for service changes	0	Nothing presented
	13	2.6
6.3 Vendor Support (20%)		
6.3.1 Clearly defined vendor and customer responsibilities	3	
6.3.2 Clearly defined problem escalation procedures	3	
6.3.3 Single vendor contact for service/support (i.e., one prime contractor)	3	
6.3.4 Timely support in all Wyoming locations	3	
6.3.5 Vendor presence in Wyoming	3	
6.3.6 Long-term commitment to doing business in Wyoming	3	
6.3.7 Training provided by vendor, if applicable	2	
	20	4
6.4 Vendor Qualifications (15%)		

6.4.1 Financial resources demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	3		
6.4.2 Technical expertise demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	2	Where is expertise?	
6.4.3 Specific staff resources and their qualifications to carry out the project during the contract period	2	Although they list senior management who would not be involved with day-to-day implementation/operation.	
6.4.4 Experience designing, delivering and managing other projects similar in scope and magnitude to this project	2	Nothing referenced for education, but plenty of big government/industry experience	
	9		1.35
6.5 Project Plan (15%)			
6.5.1 Responsiveness of the proposal in stating a clear understanding of the requirements	2	Seem interested in providing "enhancements". Not clear whether they understand the data requirements	
6.5.2 Completeness of a step-by-step implementation plan	3	Pretty generic project implementation chart...	
6.5.3 Project and operational management plan, including regular status reporting during implementation	2	Probably OK, but they don't indicate any specific reporting or timelines	
6.5.4 Complete transition plan if existing facilities will be replaced or phased out during the initial contract period	0	Not applicable	
	7		1.05
	69		15

Bidder	USWest	
Evaluator	Group	
	<u>Score</u>	
<u>Section 6 Evaluation</u>	<u>(0-3)</u>	<u>Comments</u>
6.1 <u>Functionality (30%)</u>		
6.1.1 Deliverable technology	3	
6.1.2 Compatible with existing technologies and facilities	3	
6.1.3 A totally integrated system for education and State government, as applicable	2	
6.1.4 Non proprietary (adheres to industry standards)	3	
6.1.5 Reliability	3	Need clarification in the contract
6.1.6 Scaleable	3	
6.1.7 Provisions for maintaining compatibility with future technology	3	
6.1.8 Flexible service offerings	3	
6.1.9 Reasonable response times to requests for installation of new services or de-installation of existing services (i.e., moves/adds/changes)	3	
	26	7.8
6.2 <u>Pricing (20%)</u>		
6.2.1 Long-run total costs (one-time plus five year recurring) for proposed system	3	

COPY
 of Electronic
 Archived doc
 Clementina

6.2.2 Contract renewal options	3	
6.2.3 Long-term price protection	3	
6.2.4 Lowest price guarantee	3	
6.2.5 Innovative price plans	2	
6.2.6 Schedule of additional costs and deductions for service changes	3	
	17	3.4
6.3 Vendor Support (20%)		
6.3.1 Clearly defined vendor and customer responsibilities	3	
6.3.2 Clearly defined problem escalation procedures	3	
6.3.3 Single vendor contact for service/support (i.e., one prime contractor)	3	Intra LATA? Independent territories?
6.3.4 Timely support in all Wyoming locations	3	
6.3.5 Vendor presence in Wyoming	3	
6.3.6 Long-term commitment to doing business in Wyoming	3	
6.3.7 Training provided by vendor, if applicable	3	
	21	4.2
6.4 Vendor Qualifications (15%)		

6.4.1 Financial resources demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	3	
6.4.2 Technical expertise demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	3	Staff & qualifications? Local support?
6.4.3 Specific staff resources and their qualifications to carry out the project during the contract period	3	Staff resources? Local?
6.4.4 Experience designing, delivering and managing other projects similar in scope and magnitude to this project	3	
	12	1.8
6.5 Project Plan (15%)		
6.5.1 Responsiveness of the proposal in stating a clear understanding of the requirements	3	
6.5.2 Completeness of a step-by-step implementation plan	3	
6.5.3 Project and operational management plan, including regular status reporting during implementation	3	
6.5.4 Complete transition plan if existing facilities will be replaced or phased out during the initial contract period	3	
	9	1.35
	85	18.55

Bidder	TAMSCO	
Evaluator	Group	
	<u>Score</u>	
<u>Section 6 Evaluation</u>	<u>(0-3)</u>	<u>Comments</u>
6.1 <u>Functionality (30%)</u>		
6.1.1 Deliverable technology	3	
6.1.2 Compatible with existing technologies and facilities	2	How does it interface
6.1.3 A totally integrated system for education and State government, as applicable	1	Appears to have provisions to integrate other facilities, but not integrated.
6.1.4 Non proprietary (adheres to industry standards)	3	
6.1.5 Reliability	2	Concern about many parts of system.
6.1.6 Scaleable	2	Only with more expense?
6.1.7 Provisions for maintaining compatibility with future technology	2	
6.1.8 Flexible service offerings	3	
6.1.9 Reasonable response times to requests for installation of new services or de installation of existing services (i.e., moves/adds/changes)	3	
	21	6.3
6.2 <u>Pricing (20%)</u>		
6.2.1 Long-run total costs (one-time plus five year recurring) for proposed system	1	Is cost for existing network included?

COPY
 of Electronic
 Archived doc
 Clementine 11

6.2.2 Contract renewal options	2		
6.2.3 Long-term price protection	3		
6.2.4 Lowest price guarantee	3		
6.2.5 Innovative price plans	1	Only one Plan given...need to innovate	
6.2.6 Schedule of additional costs and deductions for service changes	3	Given in 5.5	2.6
	13		
6.3 Vendor Support (20%)			
6.3.1 Clearly defined vendor and customer responsibilities	1		
6.3.2 Clearly defined problem escalation procedures	1		
6.3.3 Single vendor contact for service/support (i.e., one prime contractor)	3		
6.3.4 Timely support in all Wyoming locations	1		
6.3.5 Vendor presence in Wyoming	1		
6.3.6 Long-term commitment to doing business in Wyoming	2		
6.3.7 Training provided by vendor, if applicable	3		2.4
	12		
6.4 Vendor Qualifications (15%)			

6.4.1 Financial resources demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	1		
6.4.2 Technical expertise demonstrating the ability to carry out the project during the contract period	2	Where is expertise?	
6.4.3 Specific staff resources and their qualifications to carry out the project during the contract period	2	Although they list senior management who would not be involved with day-to-day implementation/operation.	
6.4.4 Experience designing, delivering and managing other projects similar in scope and magnitude to this project	2	Nothing referenced for education, but plenty of big government/industry experience	
	7		1.05
6.5 Project Plan (15%)			
6.5.1 Responsiveness of the proposal in stating a clear understanding of the requirements	1	Not clear	
6.5.2 Completeness of a step-by-step implementation plan	2	Backbone?	
6.5.3 Project and operational management plan, including regular status reporting during implementation	2	Talk about operational management Plan. USF Manager?	
6.5.4 Complete transition plan if existing facilities will be replaced or phased out during the initial contract period	1	Existing network not well detailed.	
	5		0.75
	58		13.1

100

**ATTACHMENT A TO PRO. JAL PRICE SHEET
COST PROPOSAL**

	ONE TIME CAPITAL	NRC CHG	MRC 1999	MRC 2000	MRC 2001	MRC 2002	MRC 2003	MRC 2004	MRC 2005	MRC 2006
OPTION 1										
	\$23,168,859	\$91,687	\$354,940	\$354,940	\$354,940	\$364,620	\$375,559	\$386,826	\$398,431	\$410,384
ANNUAL			\$4,259,284	\$4,259,284	\$4,259,284	\$4,375,446	\$4,506,709	\$4,641,911	\$4,781,168	\$4,924,603
PAY THE ONE TIME CAPITAL FOR ALL EQUIPMENT AND PAY MRC FOR THIRD PARTY TERMINATION.										
OPTION 2										
	\$6,000,000	\$91,687	\$850,864	\$850,864	\$850,864	\$364,620	\$375,559	\$386,826	\$398,431	\$410,384
ANNUAL			\$10,210,365	\$10,210,365	\$10,210,365	\$4,375,446	\$4,506,709	\$4,641,911	\$4,781,168	\$4,924,603
PAY \$6,000,000 ONE TIME CAPITAL AND PAY THE REMAINING CAPITAL OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS, PLUS THIRD PARTY TERMINATION.										
OPTION 3										
	\$6,000,000	\$91,687	\$828,364	\$828,364	\$828,364	\$364,620	\$375,559	\$386,826	\$398,431	\$410,384
ANNUAL			\$9,940,365	\$9,940,365	\$9,940,365	\$4,375,446	\$4,506,709	\$4,641,911	\$4,781,168	\$4,924,603
PAY \$6,000,000 ONE TIME CAPITAL AND PAY THE REMAINING CAPITAL OVER THE NEXT THREE YEARS PLUS THIRD PARTY TERMINATION.										
WTCI RETAIL SALES GROUP CONTRACTS WITH THE STATE FOR SOME BACKBONE MAINTENANCE.										
OPTION 4										
	\$35,120,676	\$99,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$364,620	\$375,559	\$386,826	\$398,431	\$410,384
ANNUAL			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,375,446	\$4,506,709	\$4,641,911	\$4,781,168	\$4,924,603
THE STATE FUNDS ALL MONEY UP FRONT WITH NO MONTHLY CHARGES FOR THREE YEARS.										
OPTION 5										
	\$13,931,162	\$168,000	\$451,356	\$451,356	\$451,356	\$464,897	\$478,844	\$493,209	\$508,005	\$523,246
ANNUAL			\$5,416,274	\$5,416,274	\$5,416,274	\$5,578,762	\$5,746,125	\$5,918,509	\$6,096,064	\$6,278,946
PAY ONE TIME CAPITAL AND MRC BUT WTCI RETAIL SALES GROUP DOES NOT BUILD ANY NEW NETWORK FOR FUTURE USE.										
THIS OPTION USES MORE THIRD PARTY.										

The items shown below are recommended, but are not included in the foregoing pricing:

(Capital: \$1,790,320)

1. Existing Video Conference Unit Upgrades
2. Video Conference Unit Replacement
3. ATM Edge Switch, Cheyenne/Laramie
4. Cisco 7204 Routers, 9 locations
5. Content 10 Programs Minimum (Powell Technologies)

6.1.9 Reasonable response times to requests for installation of new services or de-installation of existing services (i.e., moves/adds/changes)

Depending on the exact type of installation or de-installation requested by the State, and subject to the availability of requested equipment, TAMSCO Systems guarantees a new services or de-installation response time of not greater than two business weeks.

6.2 Pricing

6.2.1 Long-run total costs (one-time, plus recurring to June 30, 2002, plus estimated recurring to June 30, 2006) for proposed system

Estimated one-time hardware costs	\$ 7,782,691
Estimated annual recurring costs to June 30, 2002	\$ 3,998,264
Estimated annual recurring costs July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2006, including optional service contract extension (see below and response to 5.12)	\$ 4,398,090

6.2.2 Contract renewal options

TAMSCO Systems offers an option to renew the operating, management and service contract for one (1) year at a time after the initial expiration date at an estimated cost of \$ 4,398,090 per year, from July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2006.

6.2.3 Long-term price protection

TAMSCO Systems guarantees the prices, as reflected in item 6.2.1, supra, for the initial term of the contract.

6.2.4 Lowest price guarantee

TAMSCO Systems represents that the price provided in this proposal is the lowest it will provide for like, or similar, systems or services to other customers.

6.2.5 Innovative price plans

TAMSCO Systems cannot, at this time, offer a more innovative price plan. If the State determines that the proposed technical solution and the specific pricing offered herein is acceptable, and should

CPE & Maintenance

- ☐ It was not possible to determine the amount of equipment in the schools currently which is compatible with this design. No costs have been deducted from the total CPE requirements for equipment which is currently owned and reusable with this proposal.
- ☐ Cost projections for the 1998-1999 implementation timeframe have been assumed at 1/12 per month in response to projecting the costs on a year-year basis. Actual costs will be charged as CPE is placed in service.
- ☐ CPE maintenance costs will be pro-rated for the first year under a phased implementation. CPE placed in July 1998 will be payable in July for one in advance. CPE placed in August will be pro-rated for 11/12 of the annual cost, CPE placed in September will be pro-rated for 10/12 of the annual cost, etc. Maintenance in July 1999, July 2000, July 2001, and July 2002 will be annual costs due in advance.

Managed Data Services

- ☐ Managed Data Services are proposed as an integral part of the total solution offered by USWCS. The State is asked to consider a commitment for MDS support of this education technology network for the duration of the service contract (5 years).
- ☐ Cost projections for the 1998-1999 implementation timeframe have been assumed at 1/12 per month in response to projecting the costs on a year-year basis. Actual costs will be charged as network services are implemented and CPE is placed in service.

Responses to Required RFP Items

5.10 Total one-time costs to be borne by the State which are associated with implementing the proposed facilities must be itemized. One-time costs for each during the three-year implementation schedule discussed in Section 3 must be:

Response: Total One-Time Costs

Following are the one-time costs associated with the education technology network proposed herein. As previously stated, all one-time costs for the proposed network and CPE installation are projected to be expended in the first year of implementation, July 1998 through June 1999, due to the integrated functionality of the ATM-CPE service. An itemized breakdown for these one-time costs by product, school district and school building-level detail are provided in Appendix I.

Service Element	Total One-time
Frame Relay Service Installation	\$15
ATM Service Installation	\$12
Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) & Installation	\$1,60
Managed Data Service Installation	\$6
INTERACT™ Internet Service Installation	\$
OVERALL TOTAL ONE-TIME COSTS	\$

5.11 Annual recurring costs until June 30, 2002, which must be borne by the State following installation of the required telecommunications capabilities must be itemized.

Response: Annual Recurring Costs

USWCS is proposing a five-year services agreement for this network design based on the capital investment being made to deploy the infrastructure requirements. In keeping with this five-year proposal, annual recurring costs are projected from 1998 through June 2003. As stated previously in the assumptions made in the overview of this section, recurring network services have been assumed to be installed beginning July 1998 and completed by June 1999. Cost projections for the 1998-implementation timeframe have been assumed at an accumulated 1/12 per month response to projecting the costs on a year-by-year basis. Actual costs will be charged as network services are installed. The contractual obligation for all recurring costs will be fulfilled on June 30, 2003 on a co-terminous basis.

Following are the recurring costs associated with the education technology network proposed herein. An itemized breakdown for these recurring costs by product, school district, and school building-level detail are provided in Appendix I.

Element	Annual Recurring Cost
July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999	\$1,690
July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000	\$3,121
July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001	\$3,121
July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002	\$3,121
July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003	\$3,121

5.12 Estimated annual recurring costs which must be borne by the State for the period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2006, must be itemized. Rationale for the estimates must be stated.

Response: Annual Recurring Costs

USWCS is proposing a five-year services agreement for this network design based on the capital investment being made to deploy the infrastructure requirements. In keeping with this five-year proposal, annual recurring costs for the period July 1 through June 30, 2003 have been provided in item 5.11 above. Cost projections for the 2003-2006 timeframe are listed below. A 3-year renewal option is being proposed which will require both parties' approval at the end of the initial contract period. If the renewal option is exercised, services will be provided at the costs stated here through June 30, 2006.

The rationale for pricing these services has been to factor in an inflation rate for current costs.

An itemized breakdown for these recurring costs by product, school district, and school building-level detail are provided in Appendix I.

Element

Annual Recurring Co

July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004

\$3,375.9

July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005

\$3,387.1

July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006

\$3,1

CPE Leasing Options

USWCS is providing a leasing option for the State of Wyoming should they elect to purchase the required CPE outright. The State is under no obligation to select this option--it is being provided solely for comparison purposes. If the State currently has an established arrangement with a leasing company which is more advantageous than these proposed rates, the State may choose an alternate lease arrangement.

The below rates are valid for thirty (30) days from the date of September 23, 1997 subject to credit review and documentation acceptable to all parties. Subsequent to that time, if equal maturity U S Treasury Obligations rise more than 25 basis points, the right is reserved to adjust lease payments proportionately. These payments are based on a CPE purchase amount of \$1,607,537 and \$30,155 per month for CPE Maintenance.

	Term	Interest Rate	Monthly Payment	Lease Factor
Without Maintenance	36 mos.	5.80%	\$49,335.31	0.03069
With Maintenance	36 mos.	5.80%	\$82,651.76	0.03069
Without Maintenance	60 mos.	5.84%	\$30,816.48	0.01
With Maintenance	60 mos.	5.84%	\$65,500.77	0.01917

incentives to "adopt-a-classroom." USWCS Wyoming Vice President, St Bader, was recently appointed by Governor Geringer to serve on a panel for industry advisors for planning Wyoming "Net Day" activities.

In summary, USWC of Wyoming has the following number of employees, property tax debt, contributions to non-profit organizations, and capital investments as evidenced by these current 1996 statistics.

Employees in Wyoming: 415

Property Taxes paid in Wyoming: \$2,200,000

U S WEST Foundation Contributions in Wyoming: \$219,000

Capital Investment in Wyoming: \$62,000,000

Independent Local Exchange Carriers

USWCS has a long-standing relationship with the eleven Wyoming Independent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs). We work in unison to provide Wyoming customers with telecommunications products and services. Following is a brief summary describing these suppliers who are committed to providing quality services to schools in their respective communities.

Local Exchange Providers with a presence in Wyoming who have provided illustrative pricing for inclusion in this response include the following:

- ☐ All West Communications
- ☐ Chugwater Telephone Company
- ☐ Dubois Telephone Exchange, Inc.
- ☐ PTI Communications,
- ☐ RT Communications, Inc.
- ☐ Range Telephone Cooperative, Inc.
- ☐ Silver Star Telephone Company
- ☐ Sprint Corporation
- ☐ Tri County Telephone Association, Inc.
- ☐ TCT WEST, Inc.
- ☐ Union Telephone Company

RT Communications was established in 1994 as a subsidiary of Range Telephone Cooperative, Inc., with headquarters in Worland. It currently has fifty (50) employees and approximately 15,000 customers. It is an Independent Telephone Company with subscribers in 16 rural exchanges throughout Wyoming, sections of Montana, Nebraska, and South Dakota. Wyoming exchanges include Albin, Burns, Carpenter, Gas Hills, Hulme, Jeffrey City, Kaycee, Midwest, Moorcroft, Newcastle, Osage, Pine Bluffs, Shoshoni, Thermopolis, Upton, and Worland.

RT has upgraded 13 exchanges to new NORTEL DMS 10 digital switches since 1994 and plans to upgrade the three remaining in the near future.

has invested in optional software for voicemail, switched 56 and other special services. RT has also placed over 500 miles of fiber optic cable and several digital loop subscriber carriers in its network.

Most analog carriers in the majority of exchanges have been replaced with digital carriers.

RT holds PCS licenses for Casper, Cheyenne, and Riverton and is in the development stages of this PCS network, as well as adding ISDN to its DMS 10 switches.

Besides local access, RT provides the following: Centrex, voicemail, private line services, E911, custom calling and CLASS services, internet service, and key systems.

Silver Star Communications, which operates in the lower Star Valley area of western Wyoming, is an independent company owned by the Hoopes family; Melvin and Ardell Hoopes purchased Silver Star in 1956. It currently services 2,700 access lines and covers 2,107 square miles of service area. Silver Star has twenty-five (25) full-time employees and two (2) part-time employees.

Silver Star provides a management services contract to a sister company, Teton Telcom, who employs nine (9) people and provides service to 3,100 access line subscribers.

Silver Star currently provides service to Metcalf and Holdaway Elementary Schools located in Star Valley. These schools are being serviced by fiber optic cable and a digital switch. Teton Telcom currently serves the Alta School.

Silver Star's goal is to provide the best quality of telecommunications service available in the intermountain west and aims to be a leader in the industry. It has focused on being a communications and service provider who understands its customer's needs.

Sprint Corporation's Local Telecommunications Division (LTD), formerly United Telephone Company of the West, provides local telephone service to more than seven (7) million subscriber lines in 19 states, including the eastern Wyoming communities of Torrington, Guernsey, LaGrange, and Lingle.

Sprint LTD-Western Operations for Nebraska and Wyoming provides services in 17 exchanges with an average of 2,035 lines per exchange. Its Western Operations has invested more than \$6 billion in equipment and facilities; digital technology has been the cornerstone of its modernization and today, more than 95 percent of its access lines are digital.

Union Telephone Company provides telecommunications services in several Wyoming locations: Rock River, Encampment, Elk Mountain, Hanna, Saratoga, Shirley Basin, LaBarge, Burnt Forke, Lonetree, Lyman, Manila, Urie, and it's headquarters location, Mountain View.

It has a long history of providing superior service to its customers in Wyoming; it was incorporated in 1914 and three generations of the founding family are still active in the business. The tradition of provi

outstanding service to Wyoming continues today with its digital switches and advanced CLASS services.

In addition to local exchange-type services, Union is also a cellular provider in much of the State, as well as internet and long distance services, basic cable TV, equipment rental, and answering service.

PTI, Pacific Telecom, Inc., is the telecommunications arm of PacificCorp which grew from two small phone companies in Lebanon, Oregon and Kalispell to the fifth largest non-Bell system communications provider in America. It has carved its place by providing telecommunications services to rural and suburban areas in 12 states.

In Wyoming, PTI serves Big Piney, Boulder, Daniel, Farson, Marbleton, Medicine Bow, and Pinedale.

Dubois Telephone Exchange is a full service communications provider located in the Upper Wind River country in Dubois. Dubois Telephone also serves customers in the Crowheart area of Fremont County and the Little Snake River Valley communities of Baggs, Dixon and Savery, Wyoming.

Dubois Telephone Exchange provides digital telecommunications, local dial tone, a full range of custom calling features, Centrex and PBX systems, and specialized communications system design and installation in its serving territory.

All West Communications is the parent company of the following subsidiaries: All West/Utah, All West/Oregon, All West/Marketing, All West/Idaho, All West/Washington, and All West/WorldConnect. In Wyoming, it provides local service to Cokeville and Sage and internet access to Evanston.

Range Communications provides local service in Wyoming to Arvada, Clearmont, Decker, southeast Sheridan, Sundance, Ucross, and Uln.

TCT West is the local exchange carrier for Cowley, Frannie, Deaver, Lovell, Greybull, Manderson, Basin, Byron, and Meeteetse, while Tri County Telephone Association continues to provide services to Hyattville, Burlington, and Ten Sleep.

Chugwater Telephone Company is the service provider for the Chugwater Community with a digital switch and fiber optic availability

6.3.6 Long-term commitment to doing business in Wyoming

→ Response:

The information provided above in response to item 6.3.5 as well as the over one hundred year history of this corporation in Wyoming demonstrate U S WEST's long-term commitment to Wyoming citizens, government and businesses. From muttering machines to laser beams, U S WEST, known by several names and varied structures, has been a part of the living history of Wyoming and much of its surrounding west.

Copyright
1994

COPY
of Electronic
Archived docu
Cartering Inc.

November 17, 1997

The Honorable Jim Geringer
Governor of Wyoming
Capitol Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Dear Governor Geringer:

The Education Technology RFP Committee unanimously recommends that US West Communications, Inc. be given a "letter of intent to award" for its response to RFP No. 0409-D Technology in Education Project. US West's response met all of the criteria set down in the RFP and was innovative in its approach; recommending state-of-the-art technology that will meet current and future needs of education at all levels, along with the needs of communities in the areas of tele-medicine and economic development technology issues. Accepting US West's proposal will benefit the whole state, including those served by the Independent Telephone Companies as US West partners. The US West proposal followed the guidelines of the Wyoming Education Technology Plan and indicated a clear understanding of the Request for Proposal laid out by the committee. US West's proposal highlighted a regional approach and clearly will move Wyoming to the forefront in the US West territory for widespread deployment of Asynchronous Transfer Mode-Cell Relay (ATM-CR). In addition to meeting all the criteria and receiving the highest assignment of points, US West Communications, Inc. also was the lowest cost of the proposals submitted.

The committee's recommendation is to award a "letter of intent to award" to US West Communications and notify Western Telecommunications, Inc. and TAMSCO of this intent.

As soon as this is publicly announced, contract negotiations should begin, dependent upon an appropriate level of funding through the legislature.

Respectively submitted,

Linda Carter
Chairperson for the RFP Committee

